Remarks

Claims 1 – 24 are pending. Claims 1 – 24 are rejected. Claims 1, 5, 13 and 17 have been amended. Claims 4 and 16 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request allowance of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 15, and 17 – 24. No new matter has been added.

The title was rejected as not descriptive. The title has been amended to clearly indicate the invention.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 10, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Kostreski et al. (5,559,808). Claims 1 and 13 have been amended. Amended claims 1 and 13 require that the transmitting antenna and the receiving antenna are both at the same location (the first location). No new matter has been added. At least one place in the specification that supports having the transmitting antenna and the receiving antenna at the same location is page 19 lines 2 – 5. Kostreski et al. does not have the transmitting antenna and the receiving antenna in the same location. Kostreski et al. has multiple receiving antennas located through out the service area that point at one of the multiple transmission sites. Kostreski et al. uses the multiple transmission sites to ensure that the receiver sites have a clear line-of-sight to at least one transmission site. The current invention uses a transmitting antenna and a receiving antenna at the same location to solve a completely different problem than Kostreski et al.

Claim 2, 3, and 6 – 12 depend on allowable claim 1 and are therefore allowable.

Claim 14, 15, and 18 – 24 depend on allowable claim 13 and are therefore allowable.

Claims 8, 9, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kostreski et al. (5,559,808) in view of well known prior art. The examiner has taken official notice that effects of changing the beamwidth of antenna were well known in the arts at the time of invention. The applicant traverses this statement. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that the second wireless signals (the signal received by the directional receiving antenna) are in the Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service (MMDS) frequency range. The combination of having a sector angle of less than 45 degrees in a receiving antenna for MMDS signals in order to increase upstream capacity to support numerous users in a metropolitan area was not well known in the arts at the

time of the invention. MMDS signals were not in wide use in metropolitan areas at the time of this invention. The examiner must provide documentary evidence in the next Office action if this rejection is to be maintained. Further the examiner did not properly take official notice of this fact because the examiner did not explicitly set forth a clear and unmistakable line of reasoning underling such notice.

Applicants submit that there are numerous additional reasons in support of patentability, but that such reasons are moot in light of the above remarks and are omitted in the interests of brevity. Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 – 3, 5 – 15, and 17 – 24.

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Steven L. Webb, Reg. No. 44,395
Duft Setter Ollila & Bornsen LLC
Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22
Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004
Attn: Harley R. Ball
6391 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100
Overland Park, KS 66251-2100